

## REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application, and for the indication of allowable subject matter. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Claims 1-6, 13, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,880,924, hereinafter *Kumar et al.* *Kumar et al.* discloses an electrostatic chuck capable of rapidly dechucking a substrate. The chuck includes two electrodes 130a, 130b. As set forth in column 9, lines 49-52, different electrical potentials can be applied to the bipolar electrodes 130a, 130b. However, *Kumar et al.* does not teach or suggest that the electrodes may be of different sizes. In addition, *Kumar et al.* does not teach or suggest that the voltage applied to each of the terminals can be individually adjusted in order to control a surface potential of the plate-shaped object in order to suppress an injection of charged particles into the plate-shaped object. The Examiner appreciated this lack of teaching by *Kumar et al.* in view of the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 14 and 25.

In response to the rejection based on *Kumar et al.*, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 14. In addition, new claim 28 is prepared which is substantially similar to the combination of original claim 1 and original claim 25. With regard to claim 4, that claim has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 14, i.e., that the first of pair attraction terminals is larger in size than a second of the pair of attraction terminals. In addition, new claim 29

submitted. New claim 29 is substantially the same as the combination of original claim 4 and original claim 25.

Claim 16 has also been amended to include the subject matter of claim 14, i.e., that a first of the pair of attraction terminals is larger in size than a second of the pair of attraction terminals. In addition, new claim 30 is substantially the same as the original subject matter of claim 16 and claim 25, which the Examiner has found to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, claims 1-6, 13 and 22 are now clearly patentable over *Kumar et al.*

Claims 7 and 16-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,958,265, hereinafter *Ogahara*. However, Applicants respectfully submit that *Ogahara* does not teach or suggest the present invention. Specifically, the Examiner's attention is directed to column 8, lines 4-10, wherein the ring chucking electrode 91 is disclosed, and is described as being subjected to the same voltage as the chucking electrode 61. Accordingly, *Ogahara* does not teach or suggest independently controlling the voltages of applied to each of the respective attraction terminals. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 7 and 16-19 based on *Ogahara*.

Claim 8, which was found to contain allowable subject matter has been rewritten in independent form.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: 12-23-01

By:   
William C. Rowland  
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620